



Brevard Public Schools

ATLANTIS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL



2026-27 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

SIP Authority 1

I. School Information 2

 A. School Mission and Vision 2

 B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP
 Monitoring 2

 C. Demographic Data..... 8

 D. Early Warning Systems 9

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review 13

 A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison 14

 B. ESSA School-Level Data Review 15

 C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review 16

 D. Accountability Components by Subgroup..... 17

 E. Grade Level Data Review 19

III. Planning for Improvement..... 20

IV. Positive Learning Environment 37

V. Title I Requirements (optional)..... 41

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review 44

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus 45

School Board Approval

A "Record School Board Approval Date" tracking event has not been added this plan. Add this tracking event with the board approval date in the notes field to update this section.

SIP Authority

Section (s.) 1001.42(18)(a), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22, F.S., by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S. Code (U.S.C.) § 6311(c)(2); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, F.S., and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), F.S., who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365, F.S.; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate.

SIP Template in Florida Continuous Improvement Management System Version 2 (CIMS2)

The Department's SIP template meets:

1. All state and rule requirements for public district and charter schools.
2. ESEA components for targeted or comprehensive support and improvement plans required for public district and charter schools identified as Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI), and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI).
3. Application requirements for eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year.

I. School Information

A. School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

To meet the individual, educational, and social needs of all students through high expectations; therefore, promoting citizens of character and life-long learners in a positive and safe environment.

Provide the school's vision statement

Working together to launch life long learners with excellence as our standard.

B. School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

1. School Leadership Membership

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, enter the employee name, and identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as they relate to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.

Leadership Team Member #1

Employee's Name

Erica Back

back.eric@brevardschools.org

Position Title

Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Mrs. Back serves as the primary instructional leader responsible for ensuring the successful implementation and monitoring of the School Improvement Plan across all content areas and the positive learning environment.

Core Responsibilities:

- Oversees and monitors schoolwide data systems, including ELA, Math, Science, and EWS attendance indicators, to ensure progress toward measurable outcomes.
- Leads data-driven decision-making processes, including MTSS meetings, data chats, and schoolwide progress monitoring cycles tied to FAST, i-Ready, SSA, and attendance data.

- Ensures fidelity of Tier 1 instruction across all content areas by conducting regular walkthroughs focused on:
 - Standards-aligned instruction
 - Use of adopted curriculum (Benchmark Advance, Savvas, Reveal, EdGems, 5E Model)
 - Student engagement and discourse
- Monitors implementation of science initiatives, including:
 - 5E instructional model usage
 - STEM teacher extended learning blocks
 - Science Boot Camp effectiveness
- Oversees MTSS structures, ensuring alignment between Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 supports across academics and attendance.
- Leads strategic implementation of chronic absenteeism interventions, including:
 - Monitoring ELO student attendance and enforcing progression plans
 - Collaborating with ESE/504 teams for hospital/homebound services
- Facilitates and participates in weekly PLCs, ensuring alignment of curriculum, instruction, and data analysis.
- Engages stakeholders through School Advisory Council (SAC) and family partnerships to support school improvement priorities.
- Aligns all school systems, staffing, and professional learning to support continuous improvement and increased student achievement.

Leadership Team Member #2

Employee's Name

Allyssa Copeland

Copeland.Allyssa@brevardschools.org

Position Title

Assistant Principal

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Mrs. Copeland supports the execution of the School Improvement Plan by ensuring consistency, accountability, and daily monitoring of instructional practices and student outcomes.

Core Responsibilities:

- Oversees and monitors curriculum implementation and instructional practices across ELA, Math, and Science.
- Leads biweekly data meetings and MTSS discussions with teachers to analyze student performance and plan targeted instructional supports.
- Coordinates and monitors:
 - Tiered academic interventions (including L25 supports)

- Science reteaching cycles aligned to SSA and Penda data
- Attendance interventions for chronically absent students
- Ensures consistent and effective PLC implementation, focusing on:
 - Data analysis (FAST, i-Ready, SSA, unit assessments)
 - Alignment to pacing guides and curriculum resources
 - Identification of instructional adjustments
- Monitors the implementation and impact of STEM teacher support, including:
 - Monthly reteaching sessions for 5th grade
 - Alignment to PM3 and SSA data trends
 - Science Boot Camp planning and execution
- Conducts frequent classroom walkthroughs to monitor instructional fidelity and provide actionable feedback.
- Leads attendance improvement efforts, including:
 - Monitoring EWS reports
 - Facilitating parent communication and attendance plans
 - Tracking intervention effectiveness
- Collaborates with families to support both academic and behavioral outcomes.
- Supports the Principal in ensuring schoolwide alignment to the SIP and district expectations.

Leadership Team Member #3

Employee's Name

Jamie Dieckmann

Dieckmann.Jamie@brevardschools.org

Position Title

Instructional Coach

Job Duties and Responsibilities

Mrs. Dieckmann serves as the primary facilitator of instructional improvement, specializing in ELA and MTSS processes to ensure high-quality instruction and targeted intervention.

Core Responsibilities:

- Leads the implementation of ELA curriculum (Benchmark Advance and Savvas) aligned to B.E.S.T. Standards.
- Designs and facilitates coaching cycles, including:
 - Modeling lessons
 - Co-teaching
 - Providing feedback and reflective planning support
- Supports teachers in using data to drive instruction, including:
 - FAST and i-Ready diagnostics

- Benchmark Advance/Savvas assessments
- Ongoing progress monitoring (OPM)
- Facilitates and supports ELA PLCs, focusing on:
 - Lesson planning aligned to standards
 - Data analysis and instructional adjustments
 - Development of Tier 1 and small-group instruction
- Oversees and coordinates the MTSS process, including:
 - Developing and monitoring Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention plans
 - Organizing and facilitating MTSS meetings with staff and families
 - Supporting PMP development and progress monitoring
- Provides targeted support for Lowest 25% (L25) students, ensuring aligned interventions and monitoring progress
- Supports integration of literacy across content areas, including science vocabulary integration
- Collaborates with administration to:
 - Analyze schoolwide data trends
 - Identify instructional priorities
 - Plan professional learning aligned to school needs
- Builds teacher capacity to improve instructional clarity, engagement, and rigorous academic discourse.

2. Stakeholder Involvement

Describe the process for involving stakeholders [including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders] and how their input was used in the SIP development process (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(2), ESEA Section 1114(b)(2)).

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Atlantis Elementary engages stakeholders through a collaborative, data-driven process to ensure meaningful input in the development, implementation, and refinement of the School Improvement Plan. The school leadership team regularly reviews multiple data sources, including student performance data (FAST, i-Ready, SSA), attendance and Early Warning System (EWS) indicators, behavior trends, and parent and family survey feedback. This data is shared with instructional staff through structured Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), data meetings, and ongoing professional learning opportunities. Teachers and staff actively participate in analyzing trends, identifying root causes, and developing targeted instructional and intervention strategies aligned to school improvement priorities in ELA, Math, Science, and attendance. Families, parents, and

community stakeholders are engaged through monthly School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings, where student performance data, attendance trends, and schoolwide initiatives are presented. Stakeholders are provided opportunities to ask questions, offer feedback, and contribute to decision-making processes. Feedback gathered from SAC meetings, family surveys, and engagement events is used to refine schoolwide strategies, strengthen communication systems, and improve both academic and attendance outcomes. Additionally, collaboration with specialized support teams, including ESE and 504 staff, ensures that the needs of all learners—including those with health-related concerns and attendance barriers—are addressed through individualized supports such as hospital/homebound services and MTSS interventions. This continuous cycle of stakeholder engagement, data sharing, and collaborative decision-making ensures that the School Improvement Plan reflects the collective input of all stakeholders and remains responsive to the evolving needs of students and the school community.

3. SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the state academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan with stakeholder feedback, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(3), ESEA Section 1114(b)(3)).

The School Improvement Plan will be monitored through a systematic, data-driven process focused on ensuring effective implementation and measurable impact on student achievement across all content areas and student subgroups. Progress monitoring will occur following each i-Ready and FAST assessment window, with a specific focus on evaluating student proficiency, learning gains, and subgroup performance, including the Lowest 25% and students identified through Early Warning System indicators. Science data, including SSA and Penda performance, will also be included in the review process to ensure alignment across all academic areas. The school leadership team will conduct ongoing data analysis during PLCs, MTSS meetings, and leadership team reviews to identify trends, monitor growth, and determine necessary instructional adjustments. This process will guide decisions related to:

- Targeted instructional supports and interventions
- Professional learning needs for staff
- Resource allocation and staffing support (e.g., intervention and STEM supports)
- Attendance interventions, including monitoring ELO students and supporting students with health-related needs

Instructional fidelity will be monitored through weekly classroom walkthroughs, with a focus on standards-aligned instruction, implementation of adopted curriculum resources, student engagement, and use of evidence-based instructional strategies (e.g., explicit instruction, 5E model in science).

Walkthrough data will be used to provide timely, actionable feedback to teachers and inform coaching cycles and professional learning opportunities. Attendance data will be monitored biweekly through EWS reports and MTSS problem-solving processes to ensure timely identification and support of chronically absent students. This includes monitoring ELO student attendance and implementing progression plans when necessary, as well as collaborating with ESE/504 teams to support students requiring hospital/homebound services. A quarterly monitoring tool will be utilized in collaboration with district personnel to evaluate progress toward SIP goals, assess the effectiveness of implemented strategies, and determine necessary adjustments. Stakeholder feedback gathered through SAC meetings and ongoing communication will be incorporated into plan revisions to ensure continuous improvement. This structured and responsive monitoring system ensures that implementation remains aligned to the School Improvement Plan, instructional practices are continuously refined, and all students are supported in meeting state academic standards.

C. Demographic Data

2026-27 STATUS (PER MSID FILE)	ACTIVE
SCHOOL TYPE AND GRADES SERVED (PER MSID FILE)	ELEMENTARY PK-6
PRIMARY SERVICE TYPE (PER MSID FILE)	K-12 GENERAL EDUCATION
2025-26 TITLE I SCHOOL STATUS	
2025-26 ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED (FRL) RATE	
CHARTER SCHOOL	NO
RAISE SCHOOL	
2025-26 ESSA IDENTIFICATION *UPDATED AS OF 1	
ELIGIBLE FOR UNIFIED SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANT (UNISIG)	
2025-26 ESSA SUBGROUPS REPRESENTED (SUBGROUPS WITH 10 OR MORE STUDENTS) (SUBGROUPS BELOW THE FEDERAL THRESHOLD ARE IDENTIFIED WITH AN ASTERISK)	
SCHOOL GRADES HISTORY <i>*2022-23 SCHOOL GRADES WILL SERVE AS AN INFORMATIONAL BASELINE.</i>	2025-26: * 2024-25: B 2023-24: A 2022-23: A 2021-22: A

D. Early Warning Systems

1. Grades K-8

Current Year 2026-27

Using 2025-26 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
School Enrollment	59	72	107	88	83	82	93			584
Absent 10% or more school days	17	21	23	15	16	19	19			130
One or more suspensions	1	2	4	5	2	3	9			26
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	7	1	0	0			8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	2	0	0			6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	5	20	28	11	14	13	13			104
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	7	10	27	7	18	10	10			89
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)	5	11	15	16	17	13	24			101
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0

Current Year 2026-27

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	6	12	13	12	11	10	11			75

Current Year 2026-27

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students retained:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year	4	5	2	1	1	0	0			13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0			1

Prior Year (2025-26) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
School Enrollment	56	77	106	87	86	79	93			584
Absent 10% or more school days	14	23	17	12	12	12	13			103
One or more suspensions	2	4	8	1	2	5	1			23
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)				1	3	1				5
Course failure in Math				1	8	5	4			18
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	3	14	22	9	13	12	16			89
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	2	11	24	17	8	8	17			87
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-3)										0
Number of students with a substantial mathematics defined by Rule 6A-6.0533, F.A.C. (only applies to grades K-4)										0

Prior Year (2025-26) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	13	13	5	9	9	7			58

Prior Year (2025-26) As Last Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students retained:

INDICATOR	GRADE LEVEL									TOTAL
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained students: current year	5	5	3	1	1					15
Students retained two or more times						1				1

2. Grades 9-12 (optional)

This section intentionally left blank because it addresses grades not taught at this school or the school opted not to include data for these grades.

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

A. ESSA School, District, State Comparison

The district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

Data for 2025-26 had not been fully loaded to CIMIS at time of printing.

ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENT	2026		2025		2024	
	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†	SCHOOL	DISTRICT†	STATE†
ELA Achievement*	66	62	59	62	61	57
Grade 3 ELA Achievement	67	58	59	71	59	58
ELA Learning Gains	61	62	60	58	64	60
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52	57	56	56	60	57
Math Achievement*	70	63	64	66	62	62
Math Learning Gains	62	67	63	64	68	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41	54	51	53	59	52
Science Achievement	69	62	58	69	60	57
Social Studies Achievement*	92					
Graduation Rate						
Middle School Acceleration						
College and Career Acceleration						
Progress of ELLs in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP)	62	63		57	61	

*In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPi) than in school grades calculation.

**Grade 3 ELA Achievement was added beginning with the 2023 calculation.

† District and State data presented here are for schools of the same type: elementary, middle, high school, or combination.

B. ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2025-26 ESSA FPPI

Data for 2025-26 had not been loaded to CIMS at time of printing.

ESSA OVERALL FPPI HISTORY

2025-26	2024-25	2023-24	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21**	2019-20*
	61%	62%	59%	64%	39%	

C. ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2027-28 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA SUBGROUP	FEDERAL PERCENT OF POINTS INDEX	SUBGROUP BELOW 41%	NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 41%	NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS THE SUBGROUP IS BELOW 32%
------------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------	---	---

No ESSA data found for this school and year

D. Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS													
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2023-24	C&C ACCEL 2023-24	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	66%	67%	61%	52%	70%	62%	41%	69%					
Students With Disabilities	41%	36%	48%	41%	50%	57%	50%	43%					
Black/African American Students	55%		61%		59%	65%							
Hispanic Students	46%		38%		61%	33%							
Multiracial Students	70%	60%	94%		70%	53%							
White Students	69%	70%	61%	53%	72%	66%	44%	72%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	59%	61%	57%	53%	64%	57%	37%	63%					

2023-24 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS													
	ELA ACH.	GRADE 3 ELA ACH.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	MATH ACH.	MATH LG	MATH LG L25%	SCI ACH.	SS ACH.	MS ACCEL.	GRAD RATE 2022-23	C&C ACCEL 2022-23	ELP PROGRESS
All Students	62%	71%	58%	56%	66%	64%	53%	69%					
Students With Disabilities	34%	68%	47%	48%	46%	57%	50%	56%					
Black/African American Students	50%		70%		62%	75%							
Hispanic Students	41%		48%		52%	71%							
Multiracial Students	80%		57%		81%	71%							
White Students	65%	76%	58%	52%	67%	61%	48%	69%					
Economically Disadvantaged Students	55%	67%	55%	58%	62%	64%	55%	67%					

E. Grade Level Data Review – State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested or all tested students scoring the same.

There is no assessment data available for this school.

III. Planning for Improvement

A. Data Analysis/Reflection (ESEA Section 1114(b)(6))

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Most Improvement

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The data component demonstrating the greatest improvement was the performance of the Lowest 25% subgroup in both English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics. This growth is attributed to the intentional restructuring of intervention supports and the strategic allocation of personnel to provide consistent, targeted instruction for students most in need. In ELA, the school implemented a dedicated inclusion support model focused on students in grades 4–6 identified within the Lowest 25% subgroup. Beginning early in the school year, intervention support was provided consistently throughout the week, with an initial emphasis on addressing foundational skill gaps in primary grades during the first semester. As student needs became more defined, support was refined in the second semester to concentrate fully on intermediate grades, allowing for more intensive and targeted instruction. Additionally, dedicated planning time was built into the weekly schedule to ensure interventions were data-driven, intentional, and aligned to upcoming instructional needs. In Mathematics, the school expanded its capacity to support the Lowest 25% subgroup in grades 4–6 by securing additional instructional support through supplemental funding sources. This allowed for small-group, skills-based intervention beginning at the start of the school year and continuing with fidelity throughout all quarters. The consistency and focus of this model contributed to measurable gains in student performance. To sustain and build upon this improvement in the 2026–2027 school year, the school will further refine and expand these practices. Intervention supports will be extended to include retained third-grade students, ensuring earlier and more consistent access to targeted instruction. The ELA intervention model will be streamlined so that dedicated support personnel focus exclusively on grades 3–6 for the majority of the instructional week, maximizing impact on the identified subgroup. Primary grade support will be reallocated through additional inclusion resources to maintain continuity of foundational skill development.

In Mathematics, the school will continue the established intervention model, with adjustments to funding sources to ensure sustainability. The continued prioritization of small-group, targeted instruction for the Lowest 25% subgroup will remain a central component of the school's improvement strategy. These adjustments reflect the school's commitment to using data to drive decision-making, refining resource allocation, and ensuring that the most at-risk students receive consistent, high-quality intervention support.

Lowest Performance

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component demonstrating the lowest performance was overall Learning Gains in Mathematics, which declined by 11 percentage points compared to the prior school year. This decrease reflects a need for strengthened core instruction and more intentional integration of targeted supports for all learners, particularly within subgroups requiring additional scaffolding. A contributing factor to this decline was inconsistency in Tier 1 mathematics instruction across grade levels, which impacted students' ability to access and consistently engage with grade-level standards. Additionally, while supports for students with disabilities were in place, there was a need to more effectively align these supports to grade-level content in conjunction with Individualized Education Program (IEP) goals. This gap limited opportunities for students in the ESE subgroup to fully engage in rigorous mathematical tasks while receiving appropriate differentiation. Following Progress Monitoring 2 (PM2), the school engaged in a comprehensive benchmark analysis process to identify specific areas of deficit in student performance. In response, instructional adjustments were implemented during the second semester through the use of Targeted Achievement Plan (TAP) lessons. These lessons provided structured, standards-aligned intervention opportunities focused on addressing identified gaps. Additionally, teachers utilized i-Ready Toolbox resources to facilitate face-to-face small group instruction, as well as assigned targeted digital lessons to reinforce skill development and provide differentiated practice aligned to student need. To improve performance in the 2026–2027 school year, the school will prioritize strengthening Tier 1 mathematics instruction to ensure consistent delivery of high-quality, standards-aligned instruction across all classrooms. The integration of TAP lessons will begin in the first semester, using Progress Monitoring 3 (PM3) data from the 2025–2026 school year to proactively address known areas of need. This earlier implementation will allow for more timely intervention and sustained support throughout the year.

In addition, the school will enhance supports for the ESE subgroup by increasing opportunities for students to engage with grade-level content while receiving targeted support aligned to both standards and IEP goals. The continued use of data-driven small group instruction, supported by i-Ready Toolbox and targeted digital assignments, will ensure that interventions are responsive, intentional, and aligned to individual student needs. These strategic adjustments reflect a commitment to strengthening core instruction, improving access to rigorous content for all learners, and utilizing data-driven practices to accelerate student growth in mathematics.

Greatest Decline

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

The data component demonstrating the greatest decline from the prior year was 4th grade Mathematics proficiency, which decreased by 15 percentage points. In addition to the decline in

proficiency, 4th grade also reflected the lowest performance across Learning Gains measures, including both overall gains and gains within the Lowest 25% subgroup. This trend indicates a significant gap in student growth and mastery of grade-level mathematical standards within this cohort. A key contributing factor to this decline was inconsistency in Tier 1 mathematics instruction, which limited students' access to high-quality, standards-aligned core instruction. Data analysis revealed that students did not experience sufficient academic growth throughout the year, suggesting that reliance on intervention alone was not enough to accelerate achievement. While supplemental supports were in place, the data indicates that core instruction must be strengthened to ensure that all students are effectively engaged in rigorous, grade-level learning on a daily basis. This highlights the need to move beyond a reactive model of intervention and instead prioritize strong initial instruction as the foundation for student success. In response to these findings, the school has identified 4th grade as a priority area for targeted improvement. The plan for the 2026–2027 school year includes a comprehensive approach that emphasizes the strengthening of Tier 1 mathematics instruction through intentional instructional planning, increased alignment to standards, and consistent implementation of effective instructional strategies. Additionally, the school will restructure instructional staff to better support classroom instruction and ensure that resources are strategically allocated to meet student needs within the core environment. To further support student growth, a full year of Targeted Achievement Plan (TAP) supplemental intervention will be implemented, beginning at the start of the school year. This proactive approach will allow for earlier identification of skill deficits and provide ongoing, data-driven support aligned to grade-level standards. The combination of strengthened core instruction, strategic staffing adjustments, and sustained supplemental support is designed to improve both proficiency and learning gains outcomes in 4th grade Mathematics. These actions reflect the school's commitment to addressing instructional gaps at the core level, ensuring equitable access to high-quality mathematics instruction, and accelerating student achievement through intentional, data-driven decision-making.

Greatest Gap

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

No Answer Entered

EWS Areas of Concern

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

In reviewing the school's Early Warning System (EWS) data, chronic absenteeism has been identified as a primary area of concern. Further analysis of attendance patterns revealed that this concern is influenced by specific student populations, including those enrolled under Educational Learning Opportunity (ELO) agreements as well as students with significant health-related challenges that have resulted in extended or frequent absences. Students attending under ELO agreements demonstrated patterns of inconsistent attendance, which contributed to their classification within the

chronic absenteeism category. Additionally, a subset of students experienced excessive absences due to documented medical conditions, impacting their ability to consistently engage in instructional opportunities. These factors collectively contributed to the school's overall rate of chronic absenteeism and highlight the need for more targeted monitoring and intervention. To address this concern in the 2026–2027 school year, the school will implement a more structured and proactive approach to attendance monitoring and accountability. For students enrolled under ELO agreements, the school will strengthen oversight through ongoing attendance monitoring and adherence to established progression protocols. If chronic absenteeism persists, the school will take appropriate steps to review and potentially revoke ELO status in alignment with district guidelines, ensuring that placement decisions support student success and engagement. For students with significant health-related absences, the school will collaborate closely with ESE and 504 support staff to ensure that appropriate services and accommodations are in place. This includes utilizing hospital/homebound services when necessary to maintain continuity of instruction and support student access to grade-level content during periods of medically required absence. These adjustments reflect the school's commitment to addressing attendance barriers through equitable and responsive practices, ensuring that all students have consistent access to instruction while maintaining accountability for regular attendance.

Highest Priorities

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Instructional Practice Specifically Relating to ELA
2. Instructional Practice Specifically Relating to Math
3. Instructional Practice Specifically Relating to Science
4. Positive Learning Environment Specifically Relating to Chronic Absenteeism

B. Area(s) of Focus (Instructional Practices)

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

Area of Focus #1

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

To ensure that Atlantis Elementary earns the percentage points required to achieve the grade of A, we will increase overall ELA proficiency and learning gains. In grades K-2, we will enhance early literacy skills.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Atlantis will show an annual increase of 3% in ELA proficiency in grades 3-6.

In SY26 PM3, proficiency data was 67% therefore SY27 will need to be 70%.

In SY26 PM3, learning gains data was 62% and the goal for SY27 is 64% (+2).

In SY26 PM3, the lowest 25% learning gains data was 59% and the goal for SY27 is 61% (+2).

Atlantis will show an increase of student proficiency by 8% at each progress monitoring window (PM2 and PM3) in grades K-2 as compared to the previous year. In SY26 PM3 proficiency data was ____% therefore SY27 will need to be ____%.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

Implementation and impact of the ELA Area of Focus will be monitored through a comprehensive, multi-layered data analysis process led by the school's literacy leadership team. This team will regularly review grade-level data to identify trends, evaluate the effectiveness of instructional practices, and adjust planning, core instruction, and intervention supports as needed to ensure continuous improvement and alignment to student needs. To ensure coherence in the implementation of the ELA Area of Focus, Atlantis will establish clearly defined systems centered on collaborative planning structures, intentional collaborative planning time, and aligned learning outcomes. These systems are designed to strengthen Tier 1 core instruction and ensure consistency across

classrooms and grade levels. A refined collaborative structure will be implemented to maximize the effectiveness of staff collaboration and planning. Teachers will engage in additional dedicated planning blocks of time, providing protected time to analyze student data, align instruction, and plan targeted supports. Each collaborative planning session will follow a consistent structure, including intentional pre-work completed prior to the meeting, clearly defined “work of the day” expectations during the session, and identified follow-up actions to ensure accountability and continuity. Collaborative planning will be grounded in clearly defined learning outcomes aligned to grade-level standards and student data, ensuring that instructional decisions are purposeful and focused on priority skills. To further strengthen Tier 1 instruction and promote coherence across classrooms, Atlantis will prioritize the consistent implementation of key explicit instruction strategies, including immediate corrective feedback to address misconceptions in real time, active student response strategies to increase engagement and ensure all students are cognitively involved in learning, and the use of think-alouds to model critical thinking and make the learning process visible. The consistent use of these strategies will support deeper student understanding and improve overall instructional effectiveness. Student progress will be systematically monitored through the state’s progress-monitoring system administered three times annually, in conjunction with the i-Ready Diagnostic administered three times per year. These assessment measures will provide benchmark data to evaluate student growth toward proficiency and identify students requiring additional support or enrichment. At the classroom level, teachers will utilize ongoing formative assessment data, including unit assessments within the Benchmark Advance and Savvas instructional programs, to monitor student comprehension of newly introduced standards and skills. This data will inform instructional decision-making, allowing teachers to adjust pacing, reteach critical concepts, and provide differentiated instruction based on demonstrated student understanding. Additionally, the use of weekly Targeted Achievement Plan (TAP) lesson data will allow for timely identification of skill deficits and immediate implementation of small-group reinforcement aligned to grade-level content. This structured approach ensures that intervention is responsive, focused, and directly connected to current instructional priorities. For students receiving Tier 2 and Tier 3 support, Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) data will be consistently collected and documented within Progress Monitoring Plans (PMPs). This process will be implemented with fidelity to ensure that intervention effectiveness is regularly evaluated and adjusted based on student response. Through the alignment of universal screening data, program-based assessments, targeted progress monitoring, and coherent systems for collaboration and instruction, the school will ensure that all instructional decisions are data-driven, aligned, and focused on achieving the desired ELA outcomes for all students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Jamie Dieckmann, Instructional Coach

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the

evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

Kindergarten through fifth grade teachers will implement the Benchmark Advance curriculum, and sixth grade teachers will implement the Savvas curriculum, both of which are fully aligned to the B.E.S.T. Standards. These core instructional resources provide a coherent, standards-based framework for Tier 1 instruction and ensure consistency across grade levels in delivering high-quality literacy instruction. To support differentiated instruction and accelerate student growth, teachers will utilize a range of evidence-based supplemental programs, including i-Ready Tools for Instruction, UFLi, Magnetic Reading, Phonics for Reading, Rewards, Vocabulary Surge, FCRR, and Imagine Learning. These resources are systematic, explicit, and aligned to Florida's definition of evidence-based instructional materials, with a strong emphasis on developing foundational literacy skills, including phonological awareness and phonics, as well as comprehension. Teachers will engage in structured, standards-aligned Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) that focus on collaborative planning, data analysis, and instructional alignment. Instructional coaching will be provided through strategic planning sessions and coaching cycles to strengthen Tier 1 instruction and ensure the effective implementation of curriculum resources. Ongoing professional learning will be aligned to identified school-wide trends and instructional needs to support continuous improvement. Teachers will reference Brevard Public Schools pacing guides and instructional guidance documents with fidelity to ensure alignment to district expectations across all grade levels. Additionally, PK–12 Decision Trees will be used within the MTSS framework to guide instructional decision-making, including the selection of appropriate instructional materials and the determination of levels of support required for individual students. Implementation and impact of these interventions will be monitored through the analysis of i-Ready diagnostic data, classroom-based assessments, and ongoing progress monitoring data. Leadership will conduct regular walkthroughs to assess fidelity of instructional practices, including alignment to standards, use of evidence-based strategies, and student engagement. Data from PLCs, coaching cycles, and progress monitoring will be used to make timely instructional adjustments and ensure responsiveness to student needs.

Rationale:

The identified evidence-based practices and programs directly address the need to improve literacy outcomes, particularly in foundational skill development and overall reading proficiency. These resources have demonstrated effectiveness with diverse student populations and are aligned to both the B.E.S.T. Standards and the Brevard K–12 Comprehensive Evidence-Based Reading Plan. The selected instructional programs are designed to provide systematic and explicit instruction, which is critical for developing foundational literacy skills and supporting struggling readers. By integrating high-quality core instruction with targeted intervention supports, the school ensures that all students have access to grade-level content while receiving differentiated support as needed. Research supports that student achievement increases when teachers engage in collaborative planning, utilize high-quality instructional materials, and implement data-driven instructional practices. The inclusion of structured PLCs, instructional coaching, and ongoing professional learning ensures consistency of practice and builds teacher capacity to effectively deliver instruction aligned to student needs. Additionally, the use of a multi-tiered system of supports, guided by PK–12 Decision Trees, ensures that instructional decisions are intentional, data-informed, and responsive. This comprehensive approach supports improved student outcomes by addressing both core instruction and targeted intervention, ultimately leading to increased proficiency and learning gains across all grade levels.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Quarter 1: Establish Systems and Build Foundations

Person Monitoring:

Erica Back (Principal), Allyssa Copeland (Assistant Principal), and Jamie Dieckmann (Instructional Coach)

By When/Frequency:

August to October

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Focus: Build collaborative structures, define expectations, and establish baseline data. School Leadership: 1. Establish and communicate the collaborative planning structure, including additional planning block. 2. Define expectations for pre-work, work of the day, follow-up actions. 3. Lead grade-level collaboration using baseline data. 4. Conduct walkthroughs focused on presence of explicit instruction strategies. Instructional Coach: 1. Provide professional learning on explicit instruction strategies (immediate corrective feedback, active student response, think-alouds). 2. Model lessons demonstrating these strategies. 3. Support teams in identifying learning outcomes during planning. 4. Develop a planning protocol/tool to guide collaborative planning sessions. Teachers: 1. Participate in structured collaborative planning with required pre-work. 2. Determine focus standards and identify clear learning targets and success criteria. 3. Begin implementing explicit instruction strategies in Tier 1. 4. Use data to group students and plan initial differentiation. Students: 1. Engage in routines that promote active responding. 2. Begin using academic language tied to learning targets. 3. Participate in baseline assessments and goal-setting conversations (age-appropriate).

Action Step #2

Quarter 2: Implementation and Consistency

Person Monitoring:

Erica Back (Principal), Allyssa Copeland (Assistant Principal), and Jamie Dieckmann (Instructional Coach)

By When/Frequency:

November to January

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Focus: Strengthen consistency of Tier 1 instruction and collaborative planning practices. School Leadership: 1. Monitor fidelity of collaborative planning structures (agenda, pre-work, follow-up). 2. Conduct targeted walkthroughs focused on active student response, immediate corrective feedback and think alouds. 3. Facilitate mid-year data review (PM2/i-Ready) and adjust schoolwide priorities. Instructional Coach: 1. Provide ongoing coaching cycles (plan, model, observe, feedback). 2. Support teachers in using formative data (Benchmark/Savvas, TAP) to adjust instruction. 3. Co-plan small-group instruction aligned to weekly grade-level standards assessments. 4. Analyze walkthrough data trends and provide responsive professional learning. Teachers: 1. Consistently implement explicit instruction strategies. 2. Use formative and TAP data weekly to reteach concepts, adjust pacing, plan targeted small groups. 3. Engage in collaborative planning with focus on student work analysis. 4. Progress monitor Tier 2/Tier 3 students with fidelity. Students: 1. Demonstrate increased engagement through structured response opportunities. 2. Receive timely feedback and adjust learning based on

it. 3. Participate in small-group instruction aligned to needs.

Action Step #3

Quarter 3: Deepening Practice and Responsiveness

Person Monitoring:

Erica Back (Principal), Allyssa Copeland (Assistant Principal), and Jamie Dieckmann (Instructional Coach)

By When/Frequency:

February to March

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Focus: Refine instruction based on data and increase rigor and differentiation. School Leadership: 1. Lead data deep-dive to identify trends across grade levels and subgroups 2. Ensure alignment between Tier 1 instruction and intervention supports. 3. Monitor effectiveness of Tier 2/3 supports through PMP/OPM data reviews. Instructional Coach: 1. Support teachers in refining think-alouds for complex texts, higher-level questioning. 2. Facilitate planning conversations around rigor and student discourse. 3. Conduct targeted coaching cycles with identified teachers/groups. Teachers: 1. Adjust instruction based on ongoing data (PM2, OPM, formative). 2. Strengthen use of think-alouds and questioning to build comprehension. 3. Increase differentiation within Tier 1 before relying on intervention. 4. Continue structured planning with focus on student outcomes. Students: 1. Engage in deeper thinking through modeled reasoning (think-alouds). 2. Demonstrate ownership of learning through discussion and explanation. 3. Show progress toward proficiency and learning gains based on mid-year data.

Action Step #4

Quarter 4: Evaluate, Adjust and Sustain

Person Monitoring:

Erica Back (Principal), Allyssa Copeland (Assistant Principal), and Jamie Dieckmann (Instructional Coach)

By When/Frequency:

April to May

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Focus: Evaluate impact, solidify systems, and plan for sustainability. School Leadership: 1. Lead end of year data analysis (PM3/i-Ready) to evaluate impact. 2. Identify successful practices and systems to sustain. 3. Develop next steps for SIP alignment (identify areas of success and areas for growth). Instructional Coach: 1. Analyze coaching impact and instructional trends. 2. Support teachers in reflecting on instructional practices and student outcomes. 3. Develop resources and exemplars for sustained implementation. Teachers: 1. Reflect on effectiveness of instructional strategies and planning practices. 2. Analyze student growth and subgroup performance. 3. Provide input on systems (planning structures, strategies) for refinement. Students: 1. Demonstrate measurable growth toward proficiency and learning gain. 2. Reflect on learning progress and goals (age-appropriate).

Area of Focus #2

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

To ensure that Atlantis Elementary earns the percentage points required to achieve the grade of A, we will increase overall Math proficiency and learning gains.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Atlantis will show an annual increase of 4% in Math proficiency in grades 3-6.

In SY26 PM3, proficiency data was 66% therefore SY27 will need to be 70%.

In SY26 PM3, learning gains data was 51% and the goal for SY27 is 55% (+4).

In SY26 PM3, the lowest 25% learning gains data was 46% and the goal for SY27 is 50% (+4).

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

Implementation and impact of the Mathematics Area of Focus will be monitored through a comprehensive, data-driven framework designed to ensure progress toward Atlantis' identified proficiency and learning gains targets. Teachers will consistently monitor student performance using multiple assessment measures, including the i-Ready Diagnostic administered three times per year and the FAST Progress Monitoring system administered at three intervals annually. These universal screening tools will provide benchmark data to evaluate student growth toward proficiency and identify students requiring additional support. To ensure coherence in the implementation of the Mathematics Area of Focus, Atlantis will establish clearly defined systems centered on collaborative planning structures, intentional collaborative planning, and aligned learning outcomes. These systems are designed to strengthen Tier 1 core instruction and ensure consistency across classrooms and grade levels. A refined collaborative structure will include additional dedicated planning blocks, providing protected time for teachers to analyze student data, align instructional strategies, and plan targeted supports. Each collaborative planning session will follow a consistent structure, including intentional pre-work completed prior to the meeting, clearly defined "work of the day" expectations during the session, and identified follow-up actions to ensure accountability and continuity of work. Collaborative planning will be grounded in clearly defined learning outcomes aligned to grade-level standards and student data, ensuring that instructional decisions are purposeful and focused on priority mathematical concepts and skills. Teachers will work collectively to identify success criteria, and develop high-quality instructional plans that address identified student needs. To further strengthen Tier 1 instruction and promote coherence across classrooms, the school will prioritize the consistent implementation of key explicit instruction strategies, including immediate corrective

feedback to address misconceptions in real time, active student response strategies to increase engagement and ensure all students are cognitively involved in learning, and the use of think-alouds to model mathematical reasoning and problem-solving processes. At the classroom level, teachers will utilize ongoing formative assessment data, including unit assessments aligned to the adopted mathematics curriculum, to monitor student understanding of grade-level standards. This data will inform instructional decision-making, allowing for timely adjustments to lesson delivery, pacing, and differentiation to address identified skill deficits. Assessment data will be systematically analyzed during data meetings and grade-level planning sessions in collaboration with school administration and district resource staff. These collaborative structures will ensure that instructional planning is directly aligned to student performance trends and targeted areas of need. Through this process, teachers will refine Tier 1 instruction while also developing targeted, tiered support strategies to accelerate student learning, particularly for students not demonstrating expected growth. To further ensure fidelity of implementation, school administration will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to monitor key instructional indicators, including alignment to grade-level benchmarks, use of research-based instructional practices, and levels of student engagement. Walkthrough data will be used to provide targeted, actionable feedback to teachers and to guide ongoing instructional coaching and professional learning opportunities. This continuous cycle of coherent systems for planning and instruction will ensure that instructional practices remain responsive and aligned to student needs, ultimately supporting the achievement of the school's goals for increased mathematics proficiency, overall learning gains, and gains among the Lowest 25% subgroup.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Erica Back (Principal) and Allyssa Copeland (Assistant Principal)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

The school will implement the Reveal Math and EdGems curriculum as the primary Tier 1 instructional framework across grades K–6. These research-based instructional programs are designed to promote conceptual understanding of mathematics through coherent, vertically aligned instruction. The curriculum emphasizes student-centered learning through productive struggle, rich problem-solving tasks, inquiry-based learning experiences, and structured opportunities for mathematical discourse. Instructional delivery will focus on engaging students in all phases of learning, including problem exploration, development of mathematical thinking, guided practice, and application of concepts. Teachers will utilize built-in curriculum resources, including pre-assessments and formative checks, to identify student misconceptions and skill gaps. This data will be used to design small-group, differentiated instruction aligned to grade-level standards. Particular emphasis will be placed on monitoring and supporting students within the Lowest 25% subgroup. Teachers will use curriculum-aligned scaffolds, intervention resources, and targeted instructional strategies to close identified gaps while maintaining access to grade-level content and expectations. Implementation of

this intervention will be monitored through ongoing data analysis during collaborative planning sessions, review of student performance data from unit assessments and progress monitoring tools, and regular administrative walkthroughs to ensure fidelity to instructional expectations and alignment to research-based practices.

Rationale:

The use of high-quality, standards-aligned instructional materials, combined with structured opportunities for teacher collaboration, is supported by research as a key driver of improved student achievement. When teachers engage in collaborative planning and data analysis, they are better able to align instruction to standards, respond to student needs, and implement effective instructional strategies with consistency. Additionally, the integration of engaging, student-centered practices—such as productive struggle, inquiry-based learning, and mathematical discourse—supports deeper understanding and retention of mathematical concepts. These strategies promote critical thinking and problem-solving skills, which are essential for achieving proficiency. This intervention is further strengthened through ongoing instructional monitoring, including administrative walkthroughs, timely and actionable feedback, and the use of common assessments to measure impact. Together, these structures ensure that instructional practices are implemented with fidelity, continuously refined, and aligned to the goal of increasing student proficiency and learning gains for all learners.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Quarter 1: Build Systems and Establish Expectations

Person Monitoring:

Erica Back (Principal) and Allyssa Copeland
(Assistant Principal)

By When/Frequency:

August to October

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Focus: Establish coherent structures, baseline data, and initial implementation of explicit instruction. School Leadership: 1. Establish and communicate expectations for collaborative planning blocks, required pre-work, “work of the day,” and follow-up actions. 2. Lead beginning of year data analysis using baseline data. 3. Conduct walkthroughs to establish baseline data on alignment to standards, use of explicit instruction strategies. 4. Develop and introduce a collaborative planning protocol. 5. Set clear expectations for Tier 1 instruction. BPS Resource Instructional Coach (as needed): 1. Deliver professional learning on immediate corrective feedback, active student response, and think-alouds (mathematical process and reasoning). 2. Model lessons demonstrating explicit instruction strategies in math. 3. Support teachers in unpacking standards and defining learning outcomes. Teachers: 1. Engage in structured collaborative planning with prepared pre-work. 2. Unpack standards and align lessons to clear learning targets and success criteria. 3. Begin implementing explicit instruction strategies daily. 4. Use baseline data to group students and plan differentiation and intervention. Students: 1. Participate in structured response routines (e.g., choral response, whiteboards). 2. Begin engaging in think-aloud opportunities to explain reasoning and error analysis. 3. Set initial proficiency

and learning gain goals based on baseline data.

Action Step #2

Quarter 2: Strengthen Implementation and Consistency

Person Monitoring:

Erica Back (Principal) and Allyssa Copeland
(Assistant Principal)

By When/Frequency:

November to January

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Focus: Ensure consistent Tier 1 instruction and effective use of data during planning. School Leadership: 1. Monitor fidelity of collaborative planning structures. 2. Conduct targeted walkthroughs focused on student engagement (active responding), immediate feedback practices, and think alouds. 3. Lead mid-year data conversations (PM2/i-Ready). 4. Ensure alignment between Tier 1 instruction and intervention supports. BPS Resource Instructional Coach (as needed): 1. Implement coaching cycles. 2. Support teachers in using formative and unit assessment data to adjust instruction. 3. Co-plan math lessons incorporating explicit instruction strategies. 4. Analyze walkthrough data trends and provide responsive professional learning. Teachers: 1. Consistently apply explicit instruction strategies across math lessons. 2. Use formative assessment data to reteach skills, adjust pacing, plan targeted small groups. 3. Engage in collaborative planning focused on student work analysis. 4. Progress monitor Tier 2/3 students biweekly/weekly. Students: 1. Demonstrate increased engagement through structured participation. 2. Respond to immediate feedback to correct misconceptions. 3. Participate in targeted small-group instruction/interventions based on needs

Action Step #3

Quarter 3: Deepen Instruction and Increase Rigor

Person Monitoring:

Erica Back (Principal) and Allyssa Copeland
(Assistant Principal)

By When/Frequency:

February to March

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Focus: Strengthen mathematical reasoning and refine instruction based on data. School Leadership: 1. Facilitate deep data analysis across grade levels and subgroups. 2. Monitor effectiveness of Tier 2/3 interventions through PMP/OPM data. 3. Ensure instructional alignment across classrooms. BPS Resource Instructional Coach (as needed): 1. Support refinement of think-alouds for complex problem solving. 2. Questioning strategies to increase rigor. 3. Facilitate planning conversations focused on conceptual understanding. 4. Provide targeted coaching for teachers needing additional support. Teachers: Use ongoing data (PM2, formative, OPM) to refine instruction. 2. Increase use of think-alouds to model problem-solving processes. 3. Strengthen differentiation within Tier 1 before increasing intervention. 4. Continue structured planning with a focus on student outcomes. Students: 1. Demonstrate deeper understanding through explanation of reasoning. 2. Engage in productive discourse about mathematical thinking. 3. Show progress toward proficiency and learning gain goals.

Action Step #4

Quarter 4: Evaluate Impact and Sustain Systems

Person Monitoring:

Erica Back (Principal) and Allyssa Copeland
(Assistant Principal)

By When/Frequency:

April to May

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Focus: Evaluate effectiveness, solidify best practices, and plan for sustainability. School Leadership: 1. Lead end-of-year data analysis (PM3/i-Ready). 2. Evaluate effectiveness of collaborative structures, instructional strategies, identify practices to sustain for the next school year (identify areas of success and areas for growth). BPS Resource Instructional Coach (as needed): 1. Analyze impact of coaching and instructional shifts. 2. Support teacher reflection on instructional practices and outcomes. 3. Develop exemplar lessons and resources to sustain strong Tier 1. Teachers: 1. Reflect on effectiveness of explicit instruction strategies and planning processes. 2. Analyze student growth. 3. Provide feedback on systems (planning, collaboration) for refinement. Students: 1. Demonstrate measurable growth toward proficiency and learning gains. 2. Apply mathematical reasoning independently. 3. Reflect on learning progress and goals.

Area of Focus #3

Address the school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

To ensure that Atlantis Elementary earns the percentage points required to achieve the grade of A, we will increase overall Science proficiency.

Measurable Outcome

Measurable Outcome: Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Atlantis will show an annual increase of 3% in Science proficiency in grade 5.

In SY26 PM3, proficiency data was 70% therefore SY27 will need to be 73%.

Monitoring

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for implementation and impact to reach the desired outcome.

Implementation and impact of the Science Area of Focus will be monitored through a comprehensive, data-driven process that integrates assessment data, instructional practices, and strategic staffing supports. Teachers will monitor student progress using SSA Part 1, SSA Part 2, and Penda lesson data to ensure mastery of grade-level science benchmarks. In addition, unit assessments will be used to evaluate understanding of newly taught content and identify areas requiring reteaching and reinforcement. To ensure coherence Atlantis will establish clearly defined systems centered on collaborative structures, intentional collaborative planning, and aligned learning outcomes. These systems are designed to strengthen Tier 1 core instruction and ensure consistency across classrooms and grade levels. A refined collaborative structure will include additional dedicated planning blocks, providing protected time for teachers to analyze student data, align instructional

strategies, and plan targeted supports. Each collaborative planning session will follow a consistent structure, including intentional pre-work completed prior to the meeting, clearly defined “work of the day” expectations during the session, and identified follow-up actions to ensure accountability and continuity. Collaborative planning will be grounded in clearly defined learning outcomes aligned to grade-level science benchmarks and student data, ensuring that instructional decisions are purposeful and focused on priority concepts and skills. Teachers will work collectively to unpack standards, identify success criteria, and develop high-quality instructional plans that address identified student needs. To further strengthen Tier 1 instruction and promote coherence across classrooms, Atlantis will prioritize the consistent implementation of key explicit instruction strategies, including immediate corrective feedback to address misconceptions in real time, active student response strategies to increase engagement and ensure all students are cognitively involved in learning, and the use of think-alouds to model scientific reasoning, inquiry, and problem-solving processes. Assessment data will be systematically analyzed during data meetings and grade-level planning sessions with administration to identify trends, determine skill deficits, and guide instructional adjustments. These collaborative processes will ensure alignment between Tier 1 instruction, small-group support, and targeted reteaching opportunities. A key component of monitoring includes the strategic role of the STEM teacher, who will provide targeted support to all 5th grade classes through extended instructional blocks once per month. During the first semester, instruction will be driven by prior year PM3 data to reteach critical 3rd and 4th grade benchmarks identified as deficits. In the second semester, instruction will be adjusted based on SSA Part 1 and Part 2 data to provide responsive, standards-aligned reteaching. Administration will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of benchmark-aligned instruction, the use of the 5E instructional model, and levels of student engagement. Walkthrough data will be used to provide targeted feedback, support collaborative planning, and ensure alignment between classroom instruction and STEM teacher support. Additionally, data from Science Boot Camp sessions and classroom instruction will be reviewed to evaluate impact and adjust strategies as needed. A strong emphasis on academic vocabulary development will be monitored across all science instruction through observation, student discourse, and assessment performance. Through the alignment of universal screening data, program-based assessments, targeted progress monitoring, and coherent systems for collaboration and instruction, the school will ensure that instructional decisions remain data-driven, responsive, and focused on achieving the desired science outcomes for all students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Erica Back (Principal) and Allyssa Copeland (Assistant Principal)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored

for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

The school will implement the 5E Instructional Model (Engage, Explore, Explain, Elaborate, Evaluate) as the core Tier 1 instructional framework for science across all grade levels. This inquiry-based model promotes deep conceptual understanding through hands-on learning, student discourse, and real-world application of scientific concepts. To strengthen this model and accelerate student achievement, the school will integrate a targeted instructional support structure through the STEM teacher. The STEM teacher will provide extended monthly instructional blocks for all 5th grade classes focused on reteaching foundational science benchmarks from grades 3–5. Instruction will be aligned to identified data trends, using PM3 data from the prior year in the first semester and SSA Part 1 and Part 2 data in the second semester to ensure responsive and targeted support. In addition, the STEM teacher will collaborate with 5th grade teachers to implement Science Boot Camp sessions that reinforce grade 3, 4, and 5 standards assessed on the state assessment. These sessions will emphasize hands-on, inquiry-based learning aligned to the 5E model and will incorporate rich, standards-based tasks to deepen understanding. A strong focus on academic vocabulary development will be embedded across all science instruction to support comprehension, discourse, and assessment performance. Implementation will be monitored through: data analysis of SSA and Penda performance, review of unit assessment results, walkthrough observations focused on 5E instructional fidelity, monitoring of STEM teacher lesson alignment and impact, and collaborative planning sessions to adjust instruction based on student data.

Rationale:

The 5E Instructional Model is supported by research as an effective approach for increasing student achievement in science, as it aligns with how students naturally learn through inquiry, exploration, and application. This model promotes deeper understanding by actively engaging students in the learning process and scaffolding instruction across a structured progression. The addition of targeted STEM teacher support strengthens this approach by ensuring that instructional gaps from prior grade levels are explicitly addressed through intentional, data-driven reteaching. By providing extended instructional time focused on previously taught standards, students are able to build foundational knowledge necessary for grade-level success. The integration of Science Boot Camp further enhances this model by providing structured opportunities for hands-on, standards-aligned learning that reinforces key concepts across multiple grade levels. This approach supports increased engagement, deeper understanding, and improved retention of scientific concepts. Additionally, research supports that explicit academic vocabulary instruction improves comprehension and content mastery, particularly in science. By prioritizing vocabulary development, students are better equipped to engage in rigorous discourse and demonstrate understanding on assessments. The combination of high-quality Tier 1 instruction, strategic staffing, data-driven reteaching, and ongoing monitoring ensures a cohesive instructional system that supports increased proficiency, learning gains, and long-term student success in science.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Quarter 1: Establish Systems & Address Foundational Gaps

Person Monitoring:

Erica Back (Principal) and Allyssa Copeland
(Assistant Principal)

By When/Frequency:

August to October

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Focus: Build collaborative systems, establish expectations, and reteach foundational benchmarks
School Leadership: 1. Establish expectations for collaborative planning blocks, pre-work, “work of the day,” and follow-up actions. 2. Lead data review using prior year PM3 and baseline science data. 3. Conduct walkthroughs to establish baseline trends in benchmark alignment, use of the 5E model, and student engagement and discourse. 4. Ensure alignment of STEM teacher support with identified benchmark gaps
Leadership/STEM Teacher: 1. Provide professional learning on the 5E instructional model and explicit instruction strategies (feedback, active response, think-alouds in science). 2. Model lessons emphasizing scientific thinking and vocabulary development. 3. Support teams in unpacking science benchmarks and defining learning outcomes. 4. Deliver monthly 5th-grade STEM support sessions focused on reteaching key 3rd/4th grade standards.
Teachers: 1. Engage in structured collaborative planning with intentional pre-work. 2. Unpack benchmarks and align instruction to clear learning targets and success criteria. 3. Begin consistent use of immediate corrective feedback, active student response strategies, and think-alouds (scientific reasoning). 4. Use baseline (PM3) and beginning of year Penda data to identify and address skill gaps.
Students: 1. Engage in structured participation strategies (discussion, response routines). 2. Begin using academic vocabulary in science conversations. 3. Participate in reteaching of foundational concepts.

Action Step #2

Quarter 2: Strengthen Implementation & Data Use

Person Monitoring:

Erica Back (Principal) and Allyssa Copeland
(Assistant Principal)

By When/Frequency:

November to January

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Focus: Ensure consistency in Tier 1 instruction and refine planning based on SSA Part 1 data.
School Leadership: 1. Monitor fidelity of collaborative planning structures. 2. Conduct walkthroughs focused on student engagement, evidence of 5E implementation, and the use of explicit instruction strategies. 3. Lead SSA Part 1 data analysis and guide instructional adjustments.
STEM Teacher: 1. Support teachers in using SSA and unit assessment data to adjust instruction. 2. Continue monthly STEM support aligned to identified needs. 3. Provide support in strengthening academic vocabulary instruction.
Teachers: 1. Consistently implement the 5E model in science instruction. 2. Use SSA Part 1, unit assessment, and Penda data to adjust pacing and reteach concepts. 3. Engage in collaborative planning with a focus on student work and misconceptions
Students: 1. Demonstrate increased engagement through active participation. 2. Use feedback to refine understanding of scientific concepts.

Action Step #3

Quarter 3: Deepen Scientific Thinking & Responsiveness

Person Monitoring:

Erica Back (Principal) and Allyssa Copeland
(Assistant Principal)

By When/Frequency:

February to March

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Focus: Increase rigor, strengthen reasoning, and adjust instruction based on SSA Part 2 data School Leadership: 1. Facilitate deep data analysis across grade levels and subgroups. 2. Monitor effectiveness of Tier 1 and targeted supports. 3. Ensure alignment between classroom instruction and STEM support. STEM Teacher: 1. Support refinement of think-alouds for scientific reasoning, and questioning strategies to deepen inquiry. 2. Adjust STEM instruction based on SSA Part 2 data. Teachers: 1. Use SSA Part 2 and formative data to refine instruction. 2. Strengthen student discourse and explanation of thinking. 3. Increase rigor through higher-order questioning and inquiry. 4. Continue structured collaborative planning focused on outcomes Students: 1. Engage in deeper scientific discussions and reasoning. 2. Explain thinking using academic vocabulary. 3. Demonstrate progress toward benchmark mastery.

Action Step #4

Quarter 4: Evaluate Impact & Sustain Systems

Person Monitoring:

Erica Back (Principal) and Allyssa Copeland (Assistant Principal)

By When/Frequency:

April to May

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

Focus: Evaluate effectiveness, solidify best practices, and prepare for sustainability School Leadership: 1. Lead end-of-year data review (SSA results, unit data, Penda trends and FAST data). 2. Evaluate effectiveness of collaborative structures, instructional practices, and the STEM support model. 3. Identify systems and strategies to sustain and scale. STEM Teacher: 1. Analyze impact of coaching and STEM instructional support. 2. Support teacher reflection on instructional effectiveness. 3. Develop exemplar strategies and resources for continued use. Teachers: 1. Reflect on effectiveness of instructional strategies and planning structures. 2. Analyze student growth and subgroup performance. 3. Provide input on systems for refinement Students: 1. Demonstrate mastery of science benchmarks. 2. Apply scientific reasoning independently. 3. Reflect on learning progress and understanding of key concepts.

IV. Positive Learning Environment

Area of Focus #1

Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus for each relevant grade level, how it affects student learning and a rationale explaining how it was identified as a crucial need from the prior year data reviewed.

In review of Early Warning System (EWS) data, chronic absenteeism has been identified as a primary area of concern at Atlantis Elementary. Analysis of attendance trends indicates that this concern is largely driven by two specific student groups: students attending under an Educational Learning Opportunity (ELO) agreement and students with significant health-related challenges resulting in excessive absences. Students placed under ELO agreements have demonstrated inconsistent attendance patterns, which impacts both their academic progress and overall engagement with

school. Additionally, students experiencing extreme health concerns have missed substantial instructional time, limiting their ability to access grade-level content and maintain continuity of learning. Addressing chronic absenteeism is critical to improving student achievement, as consistent attendance is directly linked to academic success, engagement, and overall school performance. By implementing targeted monitoring systems, strengthening accountability measures, and increasing collaboration with support services, the school will work to remove attendance barriers and ensure students have consistent access to instruction.

Measurable Outcome

Include prior year data and state the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each relevant grade level. This should be a data-based, objective outcome.

Atlantis Elementary will decrease the percentage of students identified as chronically absent (attendance below 90%) by 5 percentage points during the 2026–2027 school year.

Additionally:

- Students identified as chronically absent will demonstrate improved attendance rates each quarter.
- ELO students will demonstrate improved attendance or will be reviewed for continuation of placement based on established criteria.

Monitoring

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Attendance data will be monitored on a continuous basis using school-based attendance reports and EWS indicators. Administration and the Problem-Solving/MTSS team will review attendance data biweekly to identify trends, monitor individual student progress, and determine next steps.

Attendance concerns will be discussed during:

- MTSS/data meetings
- Grade-level planning sessions (when attendance impacts academic progress)
- Individual student problem-solving team meetings

Special attention will be given to:

- Students identified as chronically absent
- Students enrolled under ELO agreements
- Students with documented medical needs

Administration will track communication logs, intervention plans, and student outcomes to ensure fidelity of implementation. Collaboration with ESE and 504 contacts will be monitored to ensure appropriate services, including hospital/homebound, are implemented when needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Erica Back (Principal) and Allyssa Copeland (Assistant Principal)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Evidence-based intervention: (May choose more than one evidence-based intervention.) Describe the evidence-based intervention (practices/programs) being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each relevant grade level and describe how the identified interventions will be monitored for this Area of Focus (20 U.S.C. § 7801(21)(A)(i) and (B), ESEA Section 8101(21)(A) and (B)).

Description of Intervention #1:

The school will implement a structured, multi-tiered attendance monitoring and intervention system aligned to MTSS practices. This system will include early identification of attendance concerns, targeted interventions, and ongoing progress monitoring to address barriers to consistent school attendance. For students attending under ELO agreements, attendance will be closely monitored with established expectations for continued enrollment. If chronic absenteeism persists, the school will implement the ELO progression plan, which may include revocation of ELO status in alignment with district guidelines to ensure placement supports student success. For students with significant health-related absences, the school will collaborate closely with ESE and 504 support staff to ensure appropriate accommodations and services are implemented. This includes utilizing hospital/homebound services when appropriate to maintain instructional continuity and access to grade-level content. Interventions may include: parent communication and attendance conferences, individual attendance plans, MTSS team problem-solving, and/or coordination with district and community resources.

Rationale:

Research indicates that consistent attendance is a critical factor in student academic success and long-term achievement. Schools that implement structured attendance monitoring systems and provide early, targeted interventions show improved attendance outcomes and increased student engagement. A tiered approach to attendance allows schools to proactively address barriers before they escalate, ensuring that supports are matched to student need. For ELO students, establishing clear expectations and accountability measures ensures that placement decisions remain aligned to student success. For students with medical needs, collaboration with ESE/504 teams ensures equitable access to instruction through appropriate supports and services. By implementing a systematic, data-driven approach to attendance monitoring and intervention, the school will reduce chronic absenteeism and improve overall student outcomes.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention:

Tier 1 – Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement:

Action step(s) needed to address this Area of Focus or implement this intervention. Identify 2 to 3 action steps and the person responsible for each step.

Action Step #1

Quarter 1: Establish Systems and Identify At-Risk Students

Person Monitoring:

Erica Back (Principal) and Allyssa Copeland (Assistant Principal)

By When/Frequency:

Quarter 1 (On-going)

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

1. Identify students with attendance below 90% and those at risk of chronic absenteeism. 2. Review all ELO student attendance data and communicate expectations for continued enrollment. 3. Establish attendance monitoring protocols and begin biweekly data reviews. 4. Initiate parent communication and attendance conferences for identified students. 5. Collaborate with ESE/504 teams to identify students needing medical supports or hospital/homebound consideration.

Action Step #2

Quarter 2: Implement Targeted Interventions

Person Monitoring:

Erica Back (Principal) and Allyssa Copeland
(Assistant Principal)

By When/Frequency:

Quarter 2 (On-going)

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

1. Continue monitoring attendance trends and adjust intervention plans as needed. 2. Implement MTSS problem-solving processes for students with persistent absenteeism. 3. Monitor ELO student attendance and begin progression plan steps as needed. 4. Ensure students with medical needs have appropriate supports in place.

Action Step #3

Quarter 3: Intensify Support and Ensure Accountability

Person Monitoring:

Erica Back (Principal) and Allyssa Copeland
(Assistant Principal)

By When/Frequency:

Quarter 3 (On-going)

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

1. Review mid-year attendance data to identify persistent concerns. 2. Continue ELO monitoring and implement revocation procedures if criteria are not met. 3. Increase targeted supports for chronically absent students through MTSS interventions. 4. Monitor effectiveness of hospital/homebound supports and adjust as needed.

Action Step #4

Quarter 4: Evaluate Impact and Plan for Sustainability

Person Monitoring:

Erica Back (Principal) and Allyssa Copeland
(Assistant Principal)

By When/Frequency:

Quarter 4 (On-going)

Describe the Action to Be Taken and how the school will monitor the impact of this action step:

1. Conduct final attendance data analysis to determine progress toward goals. 2. Evaluate effectiveness of attendance interventions and ELO processes. 3. Identify successful strategies and areas for improvement for the next school year. 4. Develop transition plans for students needing continued attendance support.

V. Title I Requirements (optional)

A. Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP)

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b) (ESEA Section 1114(b)). This section of the SIP is not required for non-Title I schools.

Dissemination Methods

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership, and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(4), ESEA Section 1114(b)(4)).

List the school's webpage where the SIP is made publicly available.

No Answer Entered

Positive Relationships With Parents, Families and other Community Stakeholders

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage where the school's Parental Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is made publicly available (20 U.S.C. § 6318(b)-(g), ESEA Section 1116(b)-(g)).

No Answer Entered

Plans to Strengthen the Academic Program

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part II of the SIP (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(ii), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(ii)).

No Answer Entered

How Plan is Developed

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other federal, state and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under this Act, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d) (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(5) and §6318(e)(4), ESEA Sections

1114(b)(5) and 1116(e)(4)).

No Answer Entered

B. Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Components of the Schoolwide Program Plan, as applicable

Include descriptions for any additional, applicable strategies that address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging state academic standards which may include the following:

Improving Student's Skills Outside the Academic Subject Areas

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(I)).

No Answer Entered

Preparing for Postsecondary Opportunities and the Workforce

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(II)).

No Answer Entered

Addressing Problem Behavior and Early Intervening Services

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior and early intervening services coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)).

No Answer Entered

Professional Learning and Other Activities

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high-need subjects (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(IV)).

No Answer Entered

Strategies to Assist Preschool Children

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs (20 U.S.C. § 6314(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V), ESEA Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(V)).

No Answer Entered

VI. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review

This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI, or CSI (ESEA Sections 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (2)(C) and 1114(b)(6)).

Process to Review the Use of Resources

Describe the process you engage in with your district to review the use of resources to meet the identified needs of students.

No Answer Entered

Specifics to Address the Need

Identify the specific resource(s) and rationale (i.e., data) you have determined will be used this year to address the need(s) (i.e., timeline).

No Answer Entered

VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Check if this school is eligible for 2026-27 UniSIG funds but has chosen
NOT to apply.

No

BUDGET	ACTIVITY	FUNCTION/ OBJECT	FUNDING SOURCE	FTE	AMOUNT
Plan Budget Total					0.00